From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXA	AMINING AUTHORIT	Υ .	PCT	
Department Intellectual Property Rue de l'Aurore 2 B-6040 Jumet RELCIOIE		OPRIETE -06- 2004 JSTRIELLE	WRITTEN OPINION  (PCT Rule 66)  L.O. 7/8,04	' <del>/</del>
		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 07/06/2004		
Applicant's or agent's file reference 4283TELEDISK		REPLY DUE within 2 / 00 months/days from the above date of mailing		
International application No.	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
PCT/EP03/50745	22/10/2003		22/10/2002	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC				
C03C17/00				
Applicant GLAVERBEL et al.				
I X Basis of the opinion  II Priority  III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability  IV Lack of unity of invention  V X Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement  VI Certain documents cited  VII Certain defects in the international application  VIII Certain observations on the international application  VIII See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).  By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3.  For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.				
Also For an additional opportunity For the examiner's obligation For an informal communicati  If no reply is filed, the international pro-	to consider amendments ion with the examiner, see	and/or arguments, see Rule 66.6.		
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is:				
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/		Authorized officer	Saga,	দ্মী
European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. (+49-89) 2399-0, Tx: 5236: Fax: (+49-89) 2399-4465 Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (march 2	_	Examiner  Formalities officer (incl. extension of tin Tel. (+49-89) 2399 2		880 at801.03
W/O BT : Dos		-	• О́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́́	

WRITTEN OPINION

Best Available Copy

## I. Basis of the opinion

- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.